

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
SHANNON WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

-against-

NEW YORK STATE UNIFIED COURT
SYSTEM OFFICE OF COURT
ADMINISTRATION, et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

VERNON S. BRODERICK, United States District Judge:

USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: _____ DATE FILED: 8/24/2021

16-CV-2061 (VSB)

ORDER

On August 10, 2021, I filed an Opinion & Order dismissing all of the Plaintiff's claims, and directed the parties to propose any redactions by August 13, 2021. ("Opinion & Order", Doc. 230.) Plaintiff subsequently sought an extension to provide redactions, (Doc. 231), which I granted, (Doc. 232).

On August 17, 2021, the parties filed a joint letter regarding their positions on redactions. (Doc. 233.) In the letter, Plaintiff proposes numerous redactions on the grounds that the redactions will protect sensitive information regarding Plaintiff and another employee. Plaintiff states that unlike the documents in the record, my Opinion & Order, "will be widely available to the general public." (*Id.*) Defendants take the position that no redactions are warranted, and oppose Plaintiff's proposed redactions on the grounds that Plaintiff seeks to redact information that is already a part of the public record and was not previously filed under seal or in redacted form. (*Id.*)

I agree with Defendants. Plaintiff's proposed redactions are nonsensical. He seeks to redact information that he in fact raised within his second amended complaint and information

that has already been made public through the voluminous court filings in this case. Conversely, Plaintiff does not seek to redact information that was previously filed under seal.

Any redaction or sealing of a court filing must be narrowly tailored to serve whatever purpose justifies the redaction or sealing and must be otherwise consistent with the presumption in favor of public access to judicial documents. *See, e.g., Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 119–20 (2d Cir. 2006). In general, the parties’ consent or the fact that information is subject to a confidentiality agreement between litigants is not, by itself, a valid basis to overcome the presumption in favor of public access to judicial documents. *See, e.g., In re Gen. Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig.*, No. 14-MD-2543 (JMF), 2015 WL 4750774, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 11, 2015). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate good cause to overcome the presumption in favor of public access to judicial documents.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to make my Opinion & Order, Document 230, available to the public.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 24, 2021
New York, New York

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Vernon Broderick". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Vernon" is written with a large, stylized "V" that loops around the first few letters of the last name. The last name "Broderick" is written in a similar cursive style.

Vernon S. Broderick
United States District Judge